

4176  
THE  
QUÆRIES  
Examined,

OR,  
FIFTY ANTI-QUERIES  
Seriously Propounded to the PEOPLE called  
PRESBYTERIANS.

Occasioned by  
The Publication of FIFTY QUERIES, Gathered out of the Works  
of Mr. RICH. BAXTER.

By J. B.

Wherein the Principal Allegations usually brought to support Infant-Baptism  
are Discovered to be Insufficient.

---

By T. G. K. G. T.

PROV. XIX. 21.

*There be many Devices in a Mans Heart, nevertheless the Council of the LORD  
that shall stand,*

Mr. Baxter more Real. p. 69.

*The true Method of one that would Arrive at certainty, and not deceive himself and  
others, is to begin at the bottom, and discern things in their nearest and most cer-  
tain Evidences, and afterwards to try the By-Objections as he is able: And not to  
Proceed first upon the Objected difficulties, and judge of all the cause by these.*

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed in the Year of our Lord 1676.

4325.aaa 32.

4176  
THE  
QUÆRIES  
Examined;

OR,  
FIFTY ANTI-QUERIES  
Seriously Propounded to the PEOPLE called  
PRESBYTERIANS.

Occasioned by  
The Publication of FIFTY QUERIES, Gathered out of the Works  
of Mr. RICH. BAXTER.

By J. B.

Wherein the Principal Allegations usually brought to support Infant-Baptism  
are Discovered to be Insufficient.

---

By T. G. K. G. J.

PROV. XIX. 21.

*There be many Devices in a Mans Heart, nevertheless the Council of the LORD  
that shall stand.*

Mr. Baxter more Real. p. 69.

*The true Method of one that would Arrive at certainty, and not deceive himself and  
others, is to begin at the bottom, and discern things in their nearest and most cer-  
tain Evidences, and afterwards to try the By-Objections as he is able: And not to  
Persevere upon the Objected difficulties, and judge of all the cause by those.*

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed in the Year of our Lord 1676.



The National Anthropological Archives  
Smithsonian Institution  
Washington, D.C.

PROV. AIX. 22.  
The National Anthropological Archives  
Smithsonian Institution  
Washington, D.C.

For the purpose of the present work, the author has been enabled to consult the original sources of the material, and to verify the accuracy of the information. The work is intended to be a complete and accurate record of the material, and to be a valuable reference for the student of the subject.

L O N D O N  
Printed in the Year of our Lord 1876



(1)

---

## The QUERIST Examined.

O R,

*Fifty Anti-Queries seriously Propounded to  
the People called Presbyterians, &c.*

Presbyteriah.

Query 1. **W** *Hither under the Covenant of Works, if Adam  
had not sinned, Innocents should not have been  
holy to God, and so Members of the Innocent  
Church or Kingdom of God?*

Baptist.

*Answer.* Query 1. Whether this be not a groundless and unlearned  
Query? for seeing the word *Church*, as used in the Holy Scrip-  
tures, signifieth A People Called out, namely, from another people.  
out of what people should they have been called, had the whole  
world been in the state of innocency? And seeing no man can tell  
whether any man should have had Authority committed to him in  
matters of Religion, or whether God should immediately have ex-  
ercised his own Government; Neither yet in what capacity chil-  
dren should have come into the world, whether endowed with know-  
ledge or otherwise; whether therefore it concern or become any  
man, to let his fancy rove about in such an unknown and unknowable  
case. And thereupon, 1. Suggest how Infants should be con-  
cern'd or not concern'd in matters of Religion? And how can any  
thing be concluded from such an imagination, as is suitable for us  
about Infant Church-membership? And whether we are not like to

B

have

Have a bad superstructure, when the foundation is a meer fancy?

Presbyterian.

*Query 2. Whether God was any more obliged to order it, so that the Children of Righteous Parents should have been born with all the Perfections of their Parents, and enjoyed the same Priviledges, than he was obliged in making the Covenant of Grace, to grant that Infants should be of the same Society with their Parents, and have the Immunities of that Society.*

Baptist.

*Antiquary 2. More obliged: Whether it be not in vain to suppose, that God was obliged at all in either of those cases, seeing he is absolutely free to do whatsoever he pleaseth with his own? And what ground have you to believe, that some Infants were more concerned than others in matters of Religion, by virtue of any Covenant made with Adam? And what Society was Infants capable of with Adam, by virtue of any Covenant made with him after his fall? Certis the Scripture is silent as to these matters.*

Presbyterian.

*Query 3. Whether we have any reason, when the design of Redemption is the magnifying of Love and Grace, so think that Love and Grace are so much less under the Gospel to the Members of Christ, than under the Law to the Members or Seed of Adam, as that then all the Seed should have partaken of the same Blessings with their righteous Parents, and now they shall all be turned out of the Society, whereas the Parents are Members?*

Baptist.

*Antiquary 3. Whether you your selves do not lessen the magnifying Love of God in Mans Redemption, whilst in respect of Infants you would restrain it to the seed of such Parents as are in Covenant with God, yea, to such Infants as partake with them in Practical of Religion, which you seem to intend by the Blessings you*  
*Speak*

(3)  
speak of. But who denies any Blessing to Infants under the Gospel, which was their portion under the Law made with Adam? And how were Infants Members of the Society of the seed of Adam, more then of the Society of the Baptists? shew the difference if you can.

Presbyterian.

Query 4. Whether though our Innocency be lost, Parents be nevertheless still, and have not as much interest in Children, and whether God have reversed this natural Order? and if God change not his Order therein, whether Parents be not as capable of consenting to grace for their children, as they were of being innocent for them?

Baptist.

Antiquary 4. Whether there be any that question whether Parents be Parents still, or what need of such Enquiries? Or what do you mean by Gods natural Order? If you mean natural Religion, then shew us what Infants are bound to in matters of Religion by nature, or what this natural Order ties Parents to do to their Infants, upon the account of Practicals in Religion, which we omit? And whether Parents could be innocent for their Infants, if their Infants were not innocent as well as they? and if not, how should their consenting to grace be the Childs consent? And whether it will not as well hold retro, that the Parents consenting to wickedness is the Childs consent? And whether this do not give the Parents the power to save or damn their Infants? And can such Councils stand with the Wisdom, Justice, or Mercy of God?

Presbyterian.

Query 5. Whether Infants be not included in the first Edition of the Covenants of Grace made with Adam? (Gen. 3. 15.) Whether unless it can be proved that Infants are none of the Womans Seed, we must not take that Fundamental Promise to extend to Infants? And was she not thereby obliged to lift her self, and all her Infant-Progeny in the Redeemers Army, against the Proclaimed Enemy, and to watch

her Posterity to do the like; And did they not continue visible Members of Christs Army and Kingdom, till such time as they violated their Fundamental Obligation, and as the Seed of the Serpent, fought against Christ and his Kingdom, for Satan and his Kingdom?

### Baptist.

Antiquary 5. Whether the Baptists do not as clearly assert Infants Right to the Grace of God in the first Edition of the Covenant, made with Adam, as any whatsoever? And if by the Seed of the Woman you understand all that are saved, who then questions Infants belonging to that seed? But where is the Woman bound to Lift her Infants in the Redeemers Army, or where shall we finde them visible Members of Christs Army in the first Edition of the Covenant? Are not these meer words without Authority of Scripture? or where did Infants ever fight for, or against the Serpent? and if not, why do you make them the Seed of the Serpent, and Fighters against the Kingdom of Christ? And if you say, you speak not these things of Infants *generally*; Then whether you have not transferr'd the Question, and so it is impertinent?

### Presbyterian.

Query 6. Whether in that first Proclamation of Grace to fallen man, or in the first Promise of Redemption to sinners, Gen. 3. 15. An Infant of the Woman be not Promised to be Generall, and Head of the Church? And whether the Promise of an Infant Head, doth not declare Gods Mind, that he will have Infants Members, because the Head is the principal Member, &c.

### Baptist.

Antiquary 6. Whether Christ in his Infancy was not as truly God as Man? and whether there be any Parity between the Infants you speak of, and Christ, seeing he was able even then to vanquish the greatest Adversary?

And if by the Redeemed Church, you mean the whole number of the saved, who doubted but Infants were of the Redeemed Church? But how doth it follow, that all that are to be saved, ought to be admitted

mitted to practical Ordinances in the visible Church? seeing then all Infants (for ought you know) have the same right, which yet you deny; but why so? are you sure they are not within the verge of Christs Redemption?

And though Christ was once an Infant, yet where do you finde that he was then a Member of the Gospel Church? Was he not *born under the Law*? *Gal. 4. 4.* and *born King of the Jews*, *Mat. 2. 2.* and according to the state of the Jewish Church, an Infant might be both a Member and a Prince; And was not the Kingly Office in *Israel* a Type of Christ? But what is this to the order and state of the Church under the Gospel? And further, though Christ an Infant was born Head of the Church as aforesaid, yet in that Infant state, he did not intermeddle with the exercise of the least part of his Authority. And then whether it be not more rational to say, that seeing Christ the Head of the Church did not actually possesse, or at least not use any part of that Power, as an Infant, or while he was an Infant? Its therefore unreasonable, that Infants (supposing they were as truly born Members of his Church, as he was born King of the Jews) should be concern'd in the actual possession of Ordinances in Infancy?

And what if we grant that Infants may be disciples by designation, a Christ was *King, Priest and Prophet* by designation, (though the Cases not alike easie to prove) yet seeing Christ was not a Prophet (as you confess) *in actu exercitio*, how came you to be so bold to bring Infants to the exercise of Baptism? And why can you not rather content your selves with the designation or dedication of your Infants to God by Prayer; and make them disciples *in actu exercitio*, when they are able? And whether you may not as well repute them thus among disciples, and as safely conclude them to be in the Covenant of Grace, and of the Redeemed Church without Baptism, as without the Lords Supper? Sith its said, *Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of God, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;* as well as it is said, *Except a man be born again of water &c. he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* And whether Dr. Taylor, a Learned Pedobaptist do not ingeniously confess, That the Wit of Man is not able to shew a difference in these cases?

## Presbyterian.

*Query 7. Why are those two Titles put on those two distinct Generations, (scilicet, the Posterity of Cain, and the Posterity of Seth) calling one the Sons of God, and the others the Daughters of men, Gen. 6. 2. But that the one was a Generation separated from the Church from their Birth, (their Progenitors being cast out before them) when the other was the seed of Saints not cast out, &c.*

## Baptist.

*Antiqu. 7. Whether this Text Gen. 6. 2. be not ambiguous, inasmuch that your own Doctors are not agreed about the Exposition thereof? But supposing it to respect the Posterities of Cain and Seth, yet whether it can be meant of Infants, seeing they committed none of these sins, in taking Wives, &c. And whether your Exposition do not damn all Infants proceeding from Cains Posterity, and consequently all the Infants of all Nations which profess not the true Religion?*

And supposing that the Infants of godly Parents are in some sense more immediately related to the Church, then the Infants of Pagans by reason of the Prayer and Designation of their Parents, and the opportunities of Education? yet what makes this for any actual Participation of Ordinances in the Church, and what one Ordinance did the Infants of these Sons of God partake of? And since the Scripture is wholly silent of any such thing, whether this do not more strongly conclude against Infant-baptism then for it? And whether it be needful to say any thing to the latter part of this Query, seeing we grant all, and something more then this Text will prove, though we deny them actual right to Ordinances? And whether the common or equal overthrow of these Generations, in respect of the Infants of both, do not evidently shew, that as to the business of their salvation, they were in the same condition? And then whether it be safe for us to conclude, that the wickedness of any Progenitors have any further effect upon the Infant children then to expose them to external calamities, seeing Christ died to redeem them from the condemnation brought upon them by Adam? Rom. 5. 18.



## Presbyterian.

*Query 8. Whether it was not the same Church before, and after Abraham's time; that was called the Tents of Sem? Gen. 19. 27. Was not the Jewish Church denominated the Tents of Sem? And does it not hence appear, that the Church-Privileges of that People did not begin with or from Abraham, but that they were before? And how was it the same Church that was of Sem, and of Abraham, if it had not the same sort of Members or Materials? &c.*

## Baptist.

*Antiqu. 8. Though it be true, that the Church is the same in some sense, from the beginning of the world to the end; yet whether it may not truly be said also, not to be the same in divers respects? And whether the Covenant as made with Noah, Gen. 9. do not differ from the Covenant as made with Adam, though both was made with all mankind, and is affirmed to be the Covenant of Grace by Mr. Baxter. And whether there was not yet a further difference between these and the Covenant as made with Abraham? Gen. 17. the former being made with all mankind, and never yet abrogated, (as saith Mr. Baxter). The other was made with Abraham and his Seed, distinct from the rest of Mankind, but as they should be Proselyted thereto? And though the Church may be denominated the Tents of Shem, both before and after Abraham, yet whether this conclude there was to be no alteration of the state of the Church under these times respectively? And whether in any of the Tents of Shem, before Abraham's time, so much as any one Infanc can be found admitted to the Practical Part of any Ordinance in the Church, which was peculiar to her as such, (for as touching Prayer, it is a moral duty, and to be made for all men.) And whether thus boldly to suppose a thing without the least shew of proof, be not a plain begging the main thing in Question?*

And though it be never so true, that the universal redeemed Church consist of the same Materials in all Ages, yet whether it be not evident that that God made a difference, as to the time of dispensing Ordinances to them? As first no Practical Ordinance or



ate dispensed to any Infant that we read of till *Abrahams* time; and though then Circumcision was ordained for Males, yet not for all the Male Children, for all under eight days of Age were prohibited, and yet you grant they were in that Covenant, nor any Rite at all for the Females, who yet were of the same Church? And whether under *Moses* they were not admitted to other Rites also, as the Passover, Sacrifices and other holy Feasts of the Jews? We therefore ask you why the Infants of converted Gentiles are not in as good a condition, without any Rite or Ceremony, as the Infants of all the faithful from *Adam* to *Abraham*? And whether those Infants before *Abraham* were not as happy as the Infants of *Abraham*? And then doth it not follow, that the Infants of faithful Gentiles, are as happy without Circumcision, or any other Rite or Ceremony whatsoever, as *Abrahams* was under a Ceremony, seeing God hath not obliged them to any in the days of the Gospel, or since the Abrogation of the Law and Circumcision?

Presbyterian.

Query 9. Whether if we could shew no written Law or Promise at first constituting the Duty, or granting the Privilege of Church-Membership, it were the least disparagement to our Cause, as long as we can shew those following Laws which presuppose this? If *Moses* at the end of that 2000 years the Church of God had bin without any written Law, found all the Infants of Church-Members in possession of this benefit: what need was there of a new Law about it? Or why should God promise it as a new thing?

Baptist.

Antiqu. 9. Whether if there be any such Law, you would not have shewed us where it is, long ere this day? and whether you do not now grant in effect there is no such written Law? And what need you thus to query, seeing we deny no lawful thing to Infants, to be done for them by their godly Parents, but only oppose your doing that for which you have no Law?

Pres-

## Presbyterian.

*Query 10. Whether there being certain Proof in Scripture of Infants Church-Membership, but none except that before, alledged from Gen. 3. that makes any mention of the beginning of it, but all speaking of it as no new thing; we have not great reason to assign its beginning, which from Gen. 3. is before spoken of?*

## Baptist.

*Antiqu. 10. Why do you say that Gen. 3. 15. makes mention of Infants Church-Membership, (otherwise then what we allow) Is here the least hint of your mode of making Infants Church-Members, that is, doth this place bid you admit them to any Ordinance? As for the gracious Covenant here made with Adam, do we not grant that it extends to Infants, yea, we say with Mr. Baxter, it was never abrogated?*

## Presbyterian.

*Query 11. Is it not unquestionable, that the Covenant of Grace made to Abraham the Father of the Faithful, comprehended Infants for Church-Members? And was it not the same with that Gen. 3. 15. But in some things clearer opened? Were not both these the Covenant of Grace and free Justification by Faith in the Redeemer? And did not the Covenant made to Abraham and his Seed, comprehend Infants? And should not the same Promise, expressed more concisely be expounded by the same expressed more fully?*

## Baptist.

*An. 11. Though it be unquestionable that the Covenant of Grace did extend to Infants, Gen. 3. 15. as well as in Abrahams time, yet there was a vast difference in respect of ceremonies. And whether the difference between the Baptists and Pedobaptists be not chiefly (if not only) about imposing Ceremonies upon Infants? And whether it be not evident that what Ceremonies the Word of God did ever assign to Infants, we allow them, respecting the time of their duration,*

ration, and only oppose your imposing Ceremonies upon Infants, for which you can assign no Authority in the Holy Scriptures, as is confessed by many Pedobaptists. See Mr. Baxter's Cure p. 7.

Presbyterian.

Query 12. Whether (though the Hebrews had their Peculiarities) it be at all credible, that the Infants of that one small Country only should be so differently dealt with by God, from all the World else, even Enoch's, Noah's, Sem's, and all from Adam to the end of the World, that these Infants only should be Church-Members, and no others.

Baptist.

Antiqu. 12. Whether this Query (as indeed almost all the rest) do not misstate the true state of the Case, seeing the Baptists may and do in a good sense acknowledge Infants to be related to the Church, viz. by Redemption, Pious Dedication to God &c. And seeing you grant the Hebrews had their Peculiarities, in what thing could it be but in external Rites and Ceremonies, especially concerning Infants; And shew us, if you can, any one Nation under Heaven, from the beginning of the World to this day, to whom God gave any Law to bring their Infants to any Rites either Legal or Evangelical. And sith Circumcision was forcibly put upon Infants, we ask whether you be able to prove, that any Person whatsoever are to be forced to Baptism, which Augustine tells us, Infants do strive against with great crying, from whence he infers they have no Faith. Lib. de Peccat. Mer. & Remiss. chap. 28.

Presbyterian.

Query 13. What can be more absurd, then to maintain a Transient Fact (as Mr. T. hath done) making Infants Church-Members, without any Law, Promise, or Covenant-Grant of God giving them & got? Whether a Gift that was never given be not a contradiction? (V. p. 32, 33, 39, 44, 45, 131.) And if there was any such Promise, or Covenant-Grant of Infants Church-Membership, when, or where was it revoked?

Baptist.

## Baptist.

*Antign. 13.* Whether these things be surely suggested against Mr. T. and whether you ought not to have set down his opinion in his own words? and whether he doth not mainly oppose himself against Mr. Baxter's Pretended Law for Infant Church-Membership and Baptism, whiles yet he denies not Infants a saving Promise, or the Promise of saving Propriety in God. *Antipedobapt. 3. Part. 1. 33.* And whether that Book was ever answered by Mr. Baxter, or ever will, by any other?

## Presbyterian.

*Query 14.* Was it only the Infants of the Hebrews, or of those that were at their absolute dispose, that were Church-Members? Or Venerable not the Infants of free Proselytes Church-Members too?

## Baptist.

*Antign. 14.* What need of this Query? who doubts but that as many others as became Jews by being Proselyted to the Law, were Circumcised according to the Law? But where do you find, that any, either Jews or Gentiles, when they were baptized, had any obligation to baptize their children and servants also?

## Presbyterian.

*Query 15.* Was it not then the Duty of all the Nations, round about, that could have Information of the Jewish Religion, to engage themselves, and their Children to God by Circumcision?

And did not many of the People in Hester's time become Jews, *Hest. 8. 17.* who yet were not under their Government? And is it not well known, that this was to be circumcised, they and their little ones, (as the Proselytes were) and so to keep the Law of Moses?

And whether the circumcised Servants of Israel, sold away to another Nation, and so separated from the Civil state of Israel, did continue to be Church-members, though they forsook not God? And so of the Infants, if they were sold in Infancy? And so whether In-

50  
fants might not be Church-members, that were not of the Jews Com-  
mon-wealth?

*Baptist.*

*Antiqu. 15.* Although other Nations had the liberty to become  
Jewes, yet whether they were under such an obligation, as that  
they must become Jewes, or else not be saved, is worthy considera-  
tion; and whether the contrary will not be found true, when the  
case of *Cornelius*, *Act. 10.* and of the Gentiles, *Rom. 2.* are duly  
considered, whereas the one is accepted as fearing God and work-  
ing Righteousness, as much as the Jew upon the account of his Jew-  
ish Worship? And the other Gentiles generally, who did by Na-  
ture the things contained in the Law, were counted the Circum-  
cision, so as to judge the Jew, who only had the Circumcision in the  
flesh? and not only so, but so as to be accepted of God, as far (at  
least) as the Righteousness of the Law would avail the Jew? And  
whether the Infants of these devout Gentiles was not free from any  
obligation to Circumcision, or any other external Ceremony? And  
whether there be not an evident difference between the Law and the  
Gospel in this, the one being fitted to the Jewish Nation only, so as  
to be capable of an orderly observation there only? And the Go-  
spel fitted for the observation of all Nations equally, and conse-  
quently all Nations equally obliged to the full and orderly Pro-  
fession thereof?

*Presbyterian.*

*Query 16.* Were not the Israelites Children Members of the u-  
niversal visible Church, as well as of the Congregation of Israel?

As he that is a Member of the City is a Member of the Kingdom  
and a part of a part, is a part of the whole; so was not ever  
member of the Jews Church also a member of Gods universal  
Church?

*Baptist.*

*Ant. 16.* Whether it be well said to call the universal Church visible;  
And

And whether the universal Church did not contain many thousands such, as Job, Cornelius, &c. who were neither Jews by Nature nor Religion? And whether no Infants might be said to be Members of the universal Church, who were not Members of the Jewish Church? and if not, how shall they be saved, seeing Christ is only the Saviour of his body finally?

Pre:byterian.

*Query 17. Was there ever any true Church, or Ecclesiastical Worshipping Society appointed by God in all the World since the Fall, but the Church of Christ? Were not Infants therefore either Members of Christ's Church, or of no Church of Gods Institution? Was not Moses Christ's Usher, and Moses Church and Christ's Church one according to God's Institution?*

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 17. Whether this Query be not either captious, or else impertinent? for though it should be granted, that the Church of Christ was the same in some sense from the beginning, yet who knows not that the time and way for admission of the Members thereof to external Ceremonies, was not always the same? And who doubts but the Church was always of Gods Institution? But doth it therefore follow, that the Ordinances Instituted therein, belongs to Infants? might they not have the Pascheover, as well as Circumcision, in the Mosaiical Church, and yet have neither the Lords Supper nor Baptism in the Christian Church? you deny them the one, why may not we as well deny the other?*

Baptist.

*Query 18. Whether was Abraham made a Member of the Church by Circumcision, or circumcised because a Member of the Church? The like of Infants born in his House?*

*And how can the ceasing of Circumcision prove Infants Church-Membership ceased, any more then it can prove their Church-Membership began with Circumcision; or that Women were not Church-*



(14)  
Members, because not circumcised; or that all Israel was unchurched in the XV<sup>th</sup> Elderness, when they were uncircumcised for forty years?

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 18.* Although Abraham was in the Church of God essentially by faith, yet whether formally in that Church-State, which God was then about to settle, till circumcised, will not, I suppose, be hastily affirmed? and how can Infants be said to be in the Church, as Abraham then was, seeing they have no faith as he had? And whether the Jewish Church-State did not cease *de jure*, when Circumcision so ceased? And then whether that state of Infant Church-Membership did not also cease? And like as the ceasing of the Passover *de jure*, was the ceasing of Infants right to any such Ordinance, even so we ask why the ceasing of Circumcision *de jure*, is not as truly the ceasing of Infants right to any such Ordinance? certainly, if Gods Word assign any Ordinances in lieu of the former, the place where 'tis written would have been known to this day?

Presbyterian.

*Query 19.* Whether the blessing of Abraham consists not chiefly in this, that God Promised to be a God in Covenant with him, and his Seed? And how are the believing Gentiles blessed with faithful Abraham, and Heirs of the same Promise, if their Infants are not also comprehended in the same Covenant?

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 19.* Whether the blessing of Abraham, (if you understand it of eternal life) were not the blessing of the Fathers that were before him? And whether that blessing did not belong to their Infants? And whether their Infants were Partakers with them in any Rites or Ceremonies of instituted worship? And if not, then, why may not the Infants of the Gentiles partake of the blessing of Abraham, though not concern'd in Rites or Ceremonies, or whether you think the blessing of Abraham is confined to Ce-

emony



remories in respect of Infants, if so, shew us what Ceremonies these are?

Presbyterian.

Query 20. Whether in that great Promise, Gen. 12. 3. Tribes, Kindreds, Families, do not most certainly comprehend Infants? As it was to such Families that the Promise was made before Christ, as to the Jewish Church? What warrant have we to understand Families or Tribes otherwise, when the same Promise is made to the Gentiles?

Baptist.

Antiq. 20. Whether you ought not to distinguish in this great Promise, the things which are eternal from the things that were but for a time? And then whether you can imagine, that all the temporal blessings, rites and ceremonies, concerned any Nation, as it concerned the seed of Abraham after the flesh? But if by this Promise you understand it as the Apostle Paul doth, Gal. 3. 16. then we doubt not but all the Kindreds of the Earth are concern'd in it; and then whether we do not sufficiently comprize the Gentiles therein? But how can Abrahams Rites and Ceremonies be part of this blessing to the Gentiles, which are abrogated long ago?

Presbyterian.

Query 21. Whether the second Commandment, Exod. 20. 5, 6. doth not contain a standing Promise, and discovery of Gods Resolution, concerning the children of all that love him, whether Jews or Gentiles, to whom this Commandment belongs? whether God meaneth not that his Retribution to Parents that love or hate him, shall extend to their children as such, unless they interrupt it at Age by their own Acts, and if to their children *qua* tales, then whether not to Infants?

E 2

Antiqu.

*Baptist.*

*Ant. 21.* Whoever doubted but that Infants are advantaged many way, in the blessings which God bestows on them that fear him? and accordingly greatly disadvantaged by the wickedness of their Parents, even so as to bear their Fathers iniquities many times, as is evident in the overthrow of the old world, the Cities of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, &c. yet whether the blessing or mercy of eternal life to infants, depend upon the Parents love to God? And whether the damnation of Infants depend on the wickedness of their Parents? And whether the blessings of the second Commandment belong only to the Church as such, or whether all men that follow the rules of Morality, are not within the reach of these blessings also? And then how should Infant Church-membership and Baptism be the blessings of the second Commandment seeing this Law concerns all men as men being part of the Moral Law, and is not proper to the Church only?

*Presbyterian.*

*Query 22.* Whether any without the Church are secured of Gods mercy by Promise? And whether mercy be not Promised to the children of the Faithful as such? (See *Psal.* 102. 28. and 103. 17. *Prov.* 20. 7. *Ilsa.* 61. 8, 9 and 65. 23. &c)?

*Baptist.*

*Antiqh. 22.* Whether God hath not said that his ways are all equal? And whether this do not secure Infants of Gods mercy, though not baptized? (for otherwise we say Infants are of the Redeemed Church? when God saith, That the Son shall not bear the iniquity of the Father, and every one shall bear his own iniquity, whether this be not a promise of mercy to Infant Children, and that in respect of Eternal Life? And whether the Query be not near a kin to that position of the *Papists* when they say, *Out of the Church there is no Salvation*, Restraining that word Church to Visible or Actual Professors only? And why must these five quotations be appli-

ed to Infants only, sith the things spoken of these Children, Seed, or Off-spring, are mostly such as are exclusive of Infants?

Presbyterian.

*Query 23. Whether these Promises in the making of them were limited to a certain time when they were to cease? Or whether they have been since revoked?*

Baptist.

Suppose these Promises yet remain, as we doubt not but they do, sith they are not entail'd upon the Jewish Nation, (at least the three first Quotations,) How will this avail to the point in hand? Are all the blessings of God to the Infant Off-spring of those that fear him, &c. bound up in your supposed Church-membership and Baptism?

Presbyterian.

*Query 24. If it was on the Jews Rejection of Christ, that they were broken off from being Gods People, were those thousands of Jews that believed in Christ so broken off? If not, then whether were not the Children of all believing Jews Church-members in Infancy? Or otherwise, was it not somewhat else then Unbelief that brake them off?*

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 24. Whether was those that cried, His blood be upon us and our Children, thereby rejecting the great Messenger of the Covenant, justly broken off? And whether the renting of the Vail of the Temple, did not shew the abrogation of the Covenant and the Legal Ministry? whether was Saul broken off when he persecuted the Church causing many to blaspheme? And how could the Jews lawfully be married to Christ, if Moses was not now removed, without being called an Adulterers? And then whether those thousands of Jews which believed were not first broken off, so*

as to plead no longer upon this issue, *We are Abrahams Children, we are free-born, &c.* And to look upon Circumcision and whatsoever was gain to them on a legal account; to be lost for Christ? or is there any other way to be grafted in to the Church of Christ, but by faith? Now therefore seeing the Jews were in no better case than the Gentiles, Circumcision being now nothing, even as uncircumcision was nothing, but a new creature? then whether all the Infants of the Jews now ceased to be members of any visible Church, seeing their Parents had *de jure* lost their Membership?

Presbyterian.

*Query 25. Were not the Infants of the Christian Jews the day before their Conversion Members of the Jewish Church, and of Gods universal Church, (of which the Jews were but a part? and doth it not sound strangely, that such Infants as were the day before Members of the Jewish Church, and of Gods universal Church, should be put out of the Jewish and the whole visible Church, by the faith of their Parents, or without unbelief? Either it was a Mercy to be a Member, of the Church, or not: If it was no mercy, then will it not follow, that the unbelieving Jews lost nothing by being broken off? If it was a mercy, how did the Christians Children forfeit it?*

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 25. Whether we have not sufficiently shewed, that the Infants of the Jews were now no Members of the Jewish Church, that being now abrogated, and the Gospel Church-state confirmed by the death of Christ, and the pouring out of the Holy Ghost; neither could two distinct Church states stand together de jure. And then whether it be not a great mistake for the Quærist to suppose the Jews were a part of Gods universal Church, when in truth they were no Church at all? and therefore whether the wonder which he makes about the Jews Infants which believed, be not groundless? And yet whether the Infants of the believing Jews were not in a far better estate, then when their Parents were unbelievers, sith the Curse they then had imprecated,*

*was*

was now removed? Also whether it was not a mercy, that both Parents and Infants were set free from Circumcision, which whatever it was before, now ceased to be a mercy to any man, because it was an obligation to the yoke of bondage, and rendered Christ unprofitable to such as should now receive it; and consequently a Release from that Church-Membership according to the Law, was a great mercy to Infants, who still retain Membership in the invisible Church, as they did before Circumcision was in being?

Presbyterian.

*Query 26. Whether it be credible, that he who came not to cast out Jews, but to bring in Gentiles, breaking down the Partition-wall, and making of two one Church, would have a Church of so different form and constitution, that the Church at Jerusalem should have Infant-Members, and the Church at Rome should have none? That the Jews Infants should be Members, and not Gentiles?*

*If the Jews were broken off by unbelief, should they not be grafted in again upon their Repentance of Faith? And so should not every repenting believing Jews Infants be Church-Members? Or otherwise how would their grafting in answer to their breaking off, should they be but in part grafted in?*

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 26. Whether it be not a great mistake to say, that Christ came to make the Jew and Gentile one Church, otherwise then by taking away the Jewish Church, and making all things new, 2 Cor. 5. 17. &c. And whether this might not be done without setting any of the Practical Ordinances upon Infants as under the Law? If otherwise, why have you not shewed us where Christ hath required Parents to get their Infants baptized? and where he forbade them to be brought to Imposition of Hands, the Table of the Lord, &c. If the denial of the first make our Infants no Members of the Church, doth not your denial of the other two, which do as generally pertain to Members of the Church, make*

yours none also? And if the Church at *Jerusalem, Rome, &c.* had any Infant-Members therein, in the sence wherein you would have them Members, why do you not name some one Infant so made a Member, such you know it would suffice.

Whether if the Jews grafting in, must in all Points answer to their breaking off, their Infants must not come to other Ordinances as well as Baptism? or will you say Infants cannot partake with their Parents of salvation without Baptism? or whether was the Infants of the Jews exposed to damnation by their Parents unbelief? And if so, what is become of all their Infants ever since?

### Presbyterian.

*Query 27. Was not Christ Church Spiritual before his Incarnation (when it took in Infants) and gathered in a spiritual way? Was not the visible frame of the Jewish Church set up and erected by the Father of Spirits, and were not spiritual Duties commanded then, upon Promises of spiritual blessings, even life eternal?*

*How will any prove that it was a blemish to the old frame, that Infants were Members? What was the Church the worse for Infants Rights? If it be no blemish, why must it be done away?*

### Baptist.

*Antiqu. 27. Though it be true, that Christ's Church was always spiritual in some measure, and his services such also; yet whether it be not also true, that the Church under the Law of Moses was carnal, in respect of the spirituality of the Church under the Gospel? Does not the Apostle say, 2 Cor. 3. These two Ministrations differ as much as Letter and Spirit differeth; and that the glory of the one had no glory in respect of the glory which excelleth? And is it not then rational, that the Churches concern'd under these Ministrations respectively should differ accordingly? And though it was no blemish to the Jewish Church, to have Infants Partakers of their Ordinances, which are called carnal, yet*



ed to Infants only, sith the things spoken of these Children, Seed, or Off-spring, are mostly such as are exclusive of Infants?

Presbyterian.

*Query 23. Whether these Promises in the making of them were limited to a certain time when they were to cease? Or whether they have been since revoked?*

Baptist.

Suppose these Promises yet remain, as we doubt not but they do, sith they are not entail'd upon the Jewish Nation, (at least the three first Quotations,) How will this avail to the point in hand? Are all the blessings of God to the Infant Off-spring of those that fear him, &c. bound up in your supposed Church-membership and Baptism?

Presbyterian.

*Query 24. If it was on the Jews Rejection of Christ, that they were broken off from being Gods People, were those thousands of Jews that believed in Christ so broken off? If not, then whether were not the Children of all believing Jews Church-members in Infancy? Or otherwise, was it not somewhat else then Unbelief that brake them off?*

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 24. Whether was those that cried, His blood be upon us and our Children, thereby rejecting the great Messenger of the Covenant, justly broken off? And whether the renting of the Vail of the Temple, did not shew the abrogation of the Covenant and the Legal Ministry? whether was Saul broken off when he persecuted the Church causing many to blaspheme? And how could the Jews lawfully be married to Christ, if Moses was not now removed, without being called an Adulterers? And then whether those thousands of Jews which believed were not first broken off, so*



as to plead no longer upon this issue, *We are Abrahams Children, we are free-born, &c.* And to look upon Circumcision and whatsoever was gain to them on a legal account, to be loss for Christ? or is there any other way to be grafted in to the Church of Christ, but by faith? Now therefore seeing the Jews were in no better case than the Gentiles, Circumcision being now nothing, even as uncircumcision was nothing, but a new creature? then whether all the Infants of the Jews *now ceased* to be members of any visible Church, seeing their Parents had *de jure* lost their Membership?

Presbyterian.

Query 25. *Were not the Infants of the Christian Jews the day before their Conversion Members of the Jewish Church, and of Gods universal Church, (of which the Jews were but a part? and doth it not sound strangely, that such Infants as were the day before Members of the Jewish Church, and of Gods universal Church, should be put out of the Jewish and the whole visible Church, by the faith of their Parents, or without unbelief? Either it was a Mercy to be a Member, of the Church, or not: If it was no mercy, then will it not follow, that the unbelieving Jews lost nothing by being broken off? If it was a mercy, how did the Christians Children forfeit it?*

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 25.* Whether we have not sufficiently shewed, that the Infants of the Jews were now no Members of the Jewish Church, that being now abrogated, and the Gospel Church state confirmed by the death of Christ, and the pouring out of the Holy Ghost; neither could two distinct Church states stand together *de jure*. And then whether it be not a great mistake for the Quærist to suppose the Jews were a part of Gods universal Church, when in truth they were no Church at all? and therefore whether the wonder which he makes about the Jews Infants which believed, be not groundless? And yet whether the Infants of the believing Jews were not in a far better estate, then when their Parents were unbelievers, with the Curse they then had imprecated,

was

was now removed? Also whether it was not a mercy, that both Parents and Infants were set free from Circumcision, which whatever it was before, now ceased to be a mercy to any man, because it was an obligation to the yoke of bondage, and rendered Christ unprofitable to such as should now receive it; and consequently a Release from that Church-Membership according to the Law, was a great mercy to Infants, who still retain Membership in the invisible Church, as they did before Circumcision was in being?

### Presbyterian.

Query 26. *Whether it be credible, that he who came not to cast out Jews, but to bring in Gentiles, breaking down the Partition-wall, and making of two one Church, would have a Church of so different form and constitution, that the Church at Jerusalem should have Infant-Members, and the Church at Rome should have none? That the Jews Infants should be Members, and not Gentiles?*

*If the Jews were broken off by unbelief, should they not be grafted in again upon their Repentance of Faith? And so should not every repenting believing Jews Infants be Church-Members? Or otherwise how would their grafting in answer to their breaking off, should they be but in part grafted in?*

### Baptist.

*Antiqu. 26. Whether it be not a great mistake to say, that Christ came to make the Jew and Gentile one Church, otherwise then by taking away the Jewish Church, and making all things new, 2 Cor. 5. 17. &c. And whether this might not be done without setting any of the Practical Ordinances upon Infants as under the Law? If otherwise, why have you not shewed us where Christ hath required Parents to get their Infants baptized? and where he forbade them to be brought to Imposition of Hands, the Table of the Lord, &c. If the denial of the first make our Infants no Members of the Church, doth not your denial of the other two, which do as generally pertain to Members of the Church, make yours*

yours none also? And if the Church at *Jerusalem, Rome, &c.* had any Infant-Members therein, in the sense wherein you would have them Members, why do you not name some one Infant so made a Member, sith you know it would suffice,

Whether if the Jews grafting in, must in all Points answer to their breaking off, their Infants must not come to other Ordinances as well as Baptism? or will you say Infants cannot partake with their Parents of salvation without Baptism? or whether was the Infants of the Jews exposed to damnation by their Parents unbelief? And if so, what is become of all their Infants ever since?

### Presbyterian.

*Query 27. Was not Christ Church Spiritual before his Incarnation (when it took in Infants) and gathered in a spiritual way? Was not the visible frame of the Jewish Church set up and erected by the Father of Spirits, and were not spiritual Duties commanded then, upon Promises of spiritual blessings, even life eternal?*

*How will any prove that it was a blemish to the old frame, that Infants were Members? What was the Church the worse for Infants Rights? If it be no blemish, why must it be done away?*

### Baptist.

*Antiqu. 27. Though it be true, that Christ's Church was always spiritual in some measure, and his services such also, yet whether it be not also true, that the Church under the Law of Moses was carnal, in respect of the spirituality of the Church under the Gospel? Does not the Apostle say, 2 Cor. 3. These two Ministrations differ as much as Letter and Spirit differeth; and that the glory of the one had no glory in respect of the glory which excelleth? And is it not then rational, that the Churches concern'd under these Ministrations respectively should differ accordingly? And though it was no blemish to the Jewish Church, to have Infants Partakers of their Ordinances, which are called carnal, yet*

yet whether it be not a more perfect state, when the Church do all know God, from the least to the greatest of them? And whether this be not the state of the Church under the Gospel, according to Gods Appointment? *Heb. 8. 10, 11, 12, 13.* And whether that which is less perfect ought not to vanish away when that which is more perfect is come. *In that he saith a new Covenant, he hath made the first old, now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away, Heb. 8. 13.*

### Presbyterian.

*Query 28. In what regard were the new frame better, supposing the casting out of Infants, which were in the old? How doth Infants Relation detract from its Spirituality? Do not the adult come in by the same kind of consent for themselves, as they make for their Infants? And do not the Adult blemish the Church with more carnal sins then Infants do? Would any Kingdom be more excellent, if all Infants were disfranchised? Does not Nature teach all Kingdoms on Earth, to take themselves Members, though but Infant-Members?*

### Baptist.

*Antiqu. 28. Whether it be necessary to say Infants are cast out of that whereof they were never possessed, to wit, the use of Ordinances in the new frame of the Church? Or how can Infants be said to be a spiritual seed? How are they living stones, built up a spiritual house; to offer spiritual sacrifices in a Gospel sense? Or how are your Infants a more spiritual seed then our Infants? And whether any other are by Christs Order to partake in Gospel-Ordinances, then such as therein worship God spiritually? And whether hence it be not clear, that the way of making Infants Church-members do not detract from the spirituality of the new frame of the Church? Also where hath God required the Adult to consent for their Infant Church membership in this new frame? And whether the comparison between an earthly Kingdom and the Church of Christ be any way fitting, seeing Infants have as much need of the privilege of humane Laws, for the preservation of their Lives and Rights as grown persons? But how stand they in*

need of the Laws of the Church, (and particularly Baptism) for the preservation of their souls. And whether this similitude may not be improved against you, seeing Infants, though Members of Kingdoms, yet are excused from all duties personal whatsoever, and then why may they not be reputed of the Kingdom of God; and yet exempt from the duties of his Kingdom? or how come they to be concern'd so much in that one duty of Baptism, and no other whatsoever?

Presbyterian.

Query 19. Whether any Jew at age was a Member of the old Church without professing faith, (in the Articles then necessary to salvation) Repentance and Obedience? And wherein the supposed new call and frame doth in this differ from the old, save only that a more full and express Revelation of Christ requireth a more full express Faith? Is it not evident, that they were to profess consent to Gods Covenant, which who-so denied Asa would put to death? And was not circumcision a covenanting Act? And did they not thereby profess to take God for their God? Or would God else have taken them for his People? And would not renouncing God have cut them off?

Baptist.

Antiqu. 20. What is become now of your Infant Church-membership; if when grown up they cease to be Members upon that account? Were the Jews Infants twice made Members of their Church? Or is every renewing the Covenant, (as in the case of Asa,) making men Members of the Church? But where did the Church ever admit one Member to her communion by Baptism without Profession? or where did she ever decree, that those who would not submit to her new frame should be put to death? And whether in this the new frame of the Church do not greatly differ from the old?

Presbyterian.

Query 30. Whether Gods Law obligeth not Persons to devote themselves.

themselves, and their Infants to God, by consenting to Gods Covenant for themselves and them? Whether it was not the duty of the Israelites to engage and devote their children to God in Covenant? Whether this be not evident from the Penalty (even to be cut off from his People) annexed for the non-Performance? (And whether this be not as much our Duty still?) Does not the Law of Nature bind us to give to every one his own due? and are not Infants God's own due? Does not the Law of Nature bind Parents to give them up to God by acknowledging his right, with a free resignation and dedication of the Infant to God as his own?

### Baptist.

*Antiq. 30.* Where are Christian Parents required to devote their children by consenting to any Covenant for them (or in their stead, as the Jews were in matters of Religion: and what penalty hath God imposed on them that devote not their Infants by sprinkling them as you do? And whether we do omit the duty of devoting our children to God in any thing wherein the Law of God or Nature obligeth us, (abating us all what must be abated)? And who denies Infants to be capable of Infant-relation, obligation or right, or who opposes their being devoted to God in their capacity? and whether this be not a meer noise of words, as if all that do not as you do, do lay aside their care and duties towards Infants? And where is the institution of your publick way? Have we not a more certain instituted way to devote them to God by Prayer, and to educate them in his fear, as they are capable, then you have to cross or sprinkle them?

### Presbyterian.

*Query 31.* Whether Anabaptists themselves, all of them that are truly pious, do not virtually (though not actually) devote their children to God, and consent to their Covenant-relation, while they vehemently plead against it?



## Baptist.

*Antiq. 31.* Whether you do not greatly wrong your self, and those you call Anabaptists, in saying, they vehemently plead against devoting their children to God; yea sure, they do it actually as far as Gods Word requires? And can you believe, that there is no way to devote children to God but in your way? How then did Adam, Enoch, Seth, Noah, &c. devote their children to God? And it would do well also if you could shew us how they consented to any Covenant for their Infants, more then we do? or prove if you can, that you your selves do consent to the Covenant of Grace for your Infants, more then we whom you call Anabaptists?

Does not *Eusebius Pamphilus* count Christianity as old as Adam? *I. i. c. 1.* And doth not *Tertullian* say, *Enoch iustissimum non Circumcisum nec Sabbathizantem, &c.* Enoch an upright man was translated by God, though he were not circumcised, neither yet did observe the Sabbath. --- *Ut aeternitas candidatus, &c.* To the end, that he who did aspire to Eternity might shew us, that we might please God without the burthen of *Moses Law*. And what Law (save the Law of Circumcision) did ever require Infants to be brought to Practical Ordinances in the Church of God?

## Presbyterian.

*Query 32.* Is it not a desperate undertaking, and dare any adventure on it, to justify all the World before Christs Incarnation, except the Jews, from the guilt of not dedicating their children to God? And do not they that say there is no Law in this case, say there is no Transgression? And dare any in like manner undertake to justify at the Bar of God all the World since Christs Incarnation from the guilt of sin, in not dedicating their children to Christ, and entering them into his Covenant as Members of his Church? Dare any maintain that all the World is sinless in this respect?

## Baptist.

*Antiq. 32.* Whether this be not a very unwise Query? As if none



wone of the Fathers did dedicate their Infants to God, unless they brought them to some Practical Ordinance in the Church, which is the only thing you do so complain of? And how, I pray you, did Abraham, Isaac and Jacob dedicate their female Infants to God, sith we finde no Practical Ordinance for them in Infancy? or who goes about to justify the World, if they do not as the Law of God and Nature wills them to do for their Infants? And may we not well justify all men, for not doing that which the Law of God never required?

### Presbyterian.

Query 33. *Is it not a great Benefit and Priviledge to be a visible Church-Member of Christ as Head of the Church, and of his Church as visible? Is it not a benefit in it self (besides the Causes sequents) to be visibly united and related to Christ and his Body? Is not such a Relation to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and to the Church, an honor? And how great is the misery of a contrary state?*

And if Infant Church-membership were no benefit, then how were they that had it, (when they came to Age, or their Parents in the mean time) obliged to any thankfulness for it? Will any say, that neither they nor their Parents were obliged to thankfulness upon this account?

### Baptist.

Antiqu. 33. *What benefits it to bring Infants to that which God requires not of them? or whether it be any loss to them till God requires it? And seeing you make your Redoubt from this all in all, shew us what benefit or priviledge you had when sprinkled, more then the Infants of a pious Baptist? And what is that benefit, that all who are sprinkled by the Papists, do receive, which you ratifie for good Baptism? Or how are their Infants Church-members more then ours? And whether our children when grown up, have not a fairer way to the Purity of Christianity, in that they are not entangled with such Traditions?*

(26)  
**Presbyterian.**

**Query 34.** Is it not certain that Infants are capable of this benediction if God deny it not, but will give it them as well as the aged? And is it not certain, that they are actually Members of all the Commonwealths in the World? (perfecte, led imperfecte members) And does not Nature seem actually to have taught most people on Earth, to repute their Infants in the same Religious Society with themselves, as well as in the same Civil Society?

**Baptist.**

**Answer 34.** That Infants are capable of what God will give them is very true; And we therefore ask, whether Infants be not as capable of the Lords Supper as Baptism, if the Lord will give it them? And as far as Gods Will is, that Infants should be related to his Church, we doubt not of their capacity for it. And why is the order of Commonwealths so much insisted on in this case? Are we to fetch our Rules for dispensing Ordinances in the Church, from the Civil Politie of Nations? We desire you still to show us what the Law of Nature obligeth us to do for our Infants, which we do not? Is both the Law of God and Nature broken by all that bring not their Infants to be crofled or sprinkled as you do? sure you can never make this good.

**Baptist.**

**Query 35.** Whether according to the tenour of the Covenant of Grace, God will not vouchsafe to be their God, and take them for his people, (that are in a natural or Law sense) willing to be his people, and only him for them God? And whether the Answer of believing Parents are not that willing? When Infants cannot be actually willing themselves in a natural sense, must not the reason and will of another be theirs in Law sense, that is, of the Parents, have the full dispose of them, and are warranted by the Law of Nature to choose for them (for their good) till they come to the use of Reason themselves.

(27)  
Whether in Gods acceptance the Child doth not thus truly consent by the believing Parents, and doth not Covenant with God, as a Child covenanteth and consenteth reputatively among men, who by his Parents is made a Party in Contract, as in a Lease for his Life, or the like?

And so granting the Relation of Church-membership, to be founded in a mutual contract, covenant or consent betwixt God and us, yet must not this consent on our part differ according to the different age and capacity of Infants, and the adult? Were not the Israelites Infants Church-members, who consented not actually in their own persons, but virtually, and reputatively?

### Baptist.

Antiqu. 35. We still require you to shew where this Law is, that obligeth Christians to will the baptizing of their Infants, and that will warrant the baptizing of one Person by vertue of anothers will? And why may not a reputative Baptism serve as well as a reputative Covenant, sith the Covenant is greater then Baptism? And whether this be an advised speech, that the Parent hath the whole disposal of his Child in matters of Religion? And who must judge, what is good for his Infant in religious matters? Must not Gods Word do this? And shew us what command we have omitted, in not bringing our Infants to the Font as you do? Or do you think that your instance of a Lease, is sufficient to rectifie mens consciences in matters of this nature? And what if some of the Jews had failed to consent for their children, were they therefore not in Covenant? sure it was the Law, not the Parents consent, that regulated these matters. Neither do we finde, that the Israelites were bound to repent and believe in the Person of the child, and accordingly to make profession in his Name, when circumcised, as you do at the Font when you pretend to baptize your Infants, when yet you baptize them not, seeing Sprinkling cannot be truly called Baptism?

## Presbyterian.

Query 26. Whether it be not the duty of Parents by the Law of Nature, to accept of any allowed or offered benefit for their children? the Infants being not *fui Juris*, but at his Parents dispose in all things that are for his good, have not the Parents power to oblige their children to any future duty or suffering, that is certainly for their own good? And so may they not enter them into Covenants accordingly? And is it not unnaturally sinful for a Parent to refuse to do such a thing, when it is so the great benefit of his own child? And doth it not deserve to be called the unthankful Error, that opposeth Childrens Rights, and Blessings?

## Baptist.

Antiqu. 36. Whether this Query be not the same in effect, which we have had again and again? And we would know what offered benefits the Infant of the Pedobaptists meet with, among the Papists, or your selves either, which we received not, merely for this cause of not doing to our Infants, as they and you are pleased to do? And whether it were not as reasonable for Parents to be baptized in the childs stead, as to profess faith and repentance for him? And whether it be reasonable for a Parent to oblige his Infant to be of his opinion and practice, and to suffer for the same? And what Law of God requires this, and whether this may not be called the unreasonable error?

## Presbyterian.

Query 37. Whether it may be thought, or any dare maintain, that the Covenant of Grace giveth no conditional Right to any Infants in the World? Are they all excluded? And why? Are they worse then their Parents? If it give any Right to Infants conditionally, as it doth Parents, must it not be on a condition to be performed by the Parents, or such as are so far entrusted?

Or can this be called a Covenant, for God only to say [I will save all such Infants as I elect] and yet offer Salvation to none of them

them in the World on any condition, nor give a title to any Person that can be known by themselves or others? Would it not be to confound the Decree of God with his Covenant? And what Right or Hope doth this give to Christians for their children more than to Pagans?

*Baptist.*

*Antiqu. 37.* Whether it may be thought that God should require the conditions of the Covenant of grace on them, which he knows can observe none at all; or whether it be his will, that the grace of that Covenant should depend upon others observation of the Conditions for them? And whether this be not to put the salvation of Infants out of his own hand, and into the hand of such as commonly neglect their own? And is not this to expose poor Infants to ruine, whose Parents generally are so far from keeping, that they are strangers to the Conditions of this Covenant?

And where are we taught to doubt the salvation of the Infants of Pagans? or to conclude ours only are in the state of salvation?

And is it not much more secure to hope the salvation of Infants on the Ground of Christs dying for them, and rising again for their Justification, then upon any Practical in Religion? And where did God ever since the beginning of the World, give any Ordinance to be necessary to the salvation of any Infant in the World? Can you believe that the cutting off of the uncircumcised Man-child, was a cutting off from salvation? how then were all the Infants saved which were born to the Israelites for fourty years together, such of them, I mean, as died during that time? And why may not Infants as well be made righteous without any thing done on their part, as they were made sinners without any thing done on their part? Will not the second Adams obedience salve the first Adams disobedience? And may not poor Infants better plead in the day of Judgement what Christ did for them, then what your Godfathers or Proparents did for them?

## Presbyterian.

**Query 38.** *Though all that are saved, are saved by the meritorious righteousness of Christ, by way of free Gift; yet whether the condition be not a futeable acceptance? And why may not a Parent accept a Donation for his Child, who hath no will to accept it for himself? Shall he be certainly shut out unto damnation? Or shall he have that gift absolutely which is conditional to all others? Or is he not concerned in the Donation at all? And have not Infants guilt and misery from their Parents? And though Life and Pardon be by Christ only, yet is it not congruous, that the meer condition of acceptance may be Performed by the Parents, (while they cannot accept for themselves?)*

## Baptist.

**Antiq. 38.** *Whether the meritoriousness of Christ is not as available to save Infants without any mans acceptance thereof for them? Or whether hath God ty'd the salvation of any person to the acceptance of another? And whether these be not unreasonable and unscriptural conceits? And whether it be not for want of better Grounds for Infant-Baptism, that you thus continually tautologize, varying little from that which you have said once and again?*

## Presbyterian.

**Query 39.** *(Whether it be no advantage for children to be under an early engagement to God, and Jesus Christ?) Whether to dedicate them betimes to God, doth not tend to secure Gods right and childrens good, and to prevent their sin and misery; they being thus under a double Obligation, which they may be minded of betimes, and which may hold them more strongly to their duty, and disadvantage the Tempter that would draw them off from God, &c.*

Bap.



*Baptist.*

*Antiqu. 39.* Who is against as early an engagement of children to God as can lawfully be made? and do not the *Baptists* engage their children to God as soon as they can, by Prayer and Supplication whiles Infants; and then by the best education they are able when docible? But whether any thing be done to purpose in your judgement (when yet all is done that can be done) unless it be rantized in your way? And whether it be not better to leave the event of their accepting Baptism to the wise disposal of God, then to do it *per force* in Infancy, without Precept from God? Also whether the Infant-Baptism be such a means to propagate Religion as you suppose, may be seen, when you consider how in the darkness of Popery, Pedobaptism was more common then now, but Christianity much less? And name one if you can, that was bettered in Christian vertue by Pedobaptism? we think we can name one, and that your self, which is worse for it, for had you not that to rest on, you would probably desire to put on Christ in baptism? whether it be not the fittest time to be buried with Christ in baptism, when we are dead with him from the rudiments of the world, or whether it be reasonable to bury sinners therein till they be dead to sin? and whether it can profit any person to be baptized, unless he have the answer of a good conscience, by the Resurrection of Christ from the dead, 1 *Pet.* 3. therein?

*Presbyterian.*

*Query. 40.* Whether it can be proved, that ever there was one Age or Church (particular) on Earth since Adam, till about 200 years ago, that the Anabaptists rose, wherein Infants *de facto* were not Members of the Church?

*Baptist.*

*Antiqu. 40.* Whether in your sense of making Infants Members of the Church *de facto*, it can be proved there was any one

so made a Member from the beginning of the World till *Abrahams* time? and whether *John Baptist*, *Christ*, or any by his order, did receive Infants into the Church *de facto*.

And whether the Baptist do not better prove the Antiquity of their faith and practice in baptism then any Aedobaptist in the world? and doth not your conscience tell you, that the baptism of Men and Women, upon profession of faith and repentance, is beyond the reach of contradiction? whilest *M. Baxter* himself confesses Infant-baptism to be so difficult, that many of its Assertors, both Protestants and Papists, are forced to confess it cannot be proved by the Scriptures? See his *Cure* p. 7. And seeing you and we are generally agreed, that our way both for subject and manner is out of dispute, clear in the Scriptures; and you confess by the Pen of *Mr. Baxter*, that yours is very difficult, is it not reason the difficult way should give place to the clear and evident way?

#### Presbyterian.

Query 41. Whether it can be proved, that ever there was any one Infant of true Church-members, that was not rightfully a Church-member himself from the Creation till *Christ's* days? Or from the Creation till this day; except the Anabaptists, who reject the benefit, whose case we will not presume to determine?

#### Baptist.

*Antiqu.* 41. Whether this Query be not the same we had before? and whether what is said to it, may not also suffice to this?

#### Presbyterian.

Query 42. Seeing that Infants have been *de facto* Church-members from the Creation to this day (as far as any Records can lead us) Is it likely, that the Lord, and Head, and all-sufficient Governor of his Church, would have permitted his Church till now, to be actually made up of such subjects, as in regard of Age be  
dis-

disallowed, and suffered his Church to be wrong framed till now? Or is it a reasonable, modest and lawful undertaking, to go about now in the end of the World to make God a new framed Church, as to the age of the Subjects? And is it not more modest and safe, to live quietly in a Church of that frame, as all the Saints of Heaven lived in, till the other day, as a few Anabaptists did attempt an Alteration?

### Baptist.

*Antiqu.* 42. Whether it be not utterly untrue, that Infants were Members of the Church *de facto*, i. e. to be brought to partake of Ordinances Practical in the Church, save only from *Abraham* to the end of the Law? And whether all the Pedobaptists in the world have not hitherto been unable to shew any one instance before *Abraham*, or since the Law was abrogated, so much as one Infant admitted to any such Ordinance in the Church of God, according to what the Scriptures afford in this case? And whether it be not as modest in us to labour to restore Baptism to its pure use in the Church, both in respect of the subject and manner of Administration thereof, as it was for the Protestants to do the like in respect of the Lords Supper? Also whether your pretending the Authority of the universal Church, be not the same figment, with which the Papists deceived themselves and others? And how can you pretend the universal Church, when the Primitive Church is on our side?

### Presbyterian.

Query 43. Whether considering Christs own Infant-Membership, and his kind reception of Infants, and his chiding those that would have kept them off, and his offers of taking in all the Jewish Nation, (*Matth.* 23. 37.) and that they were broken off by unbelief, and consequently the Seed of Believers broken off from the Church Universal, and that whole Households are oft said to be baptized, and that Paul pronounceth Believers children holy, and that Christ (*Mat.* 28.) commanded his Ministers, as much as in them lieth, to disciple all Nations baptizing them, &c?

so made a Member from the beginning of the World till *Abrahams* time? and whether *John Baptist*, *Christ*, or any by his order, did receive Infants into the Church *de facto*.

And whether the Baptist do not better prove the Antiquity of their faith and practice in baptism then any Aedobaptist in the world? and doth not your conscience tell you, that the baptism of Men and Women, upon profession of faith and repentance, is beyond the reach of contradiction? whilest *M. Baxter* himself confesses Infant-baptism to be so difficult, that many of its Assertors, both Protestants and Papists, are forced to confess it cannot be proved by the Scriptures? See his *Cure* p. 7. And seeing you and we are generally agreed, that our way both for subject and manner is out of dispute, clear in the Scriptures; and you confess by the Pen of *Mr. Baxter*, that yours is very difficult, is it not reason the difficult way should give place to the clear and evident way?

#### Presbyterian.

Query 41. Whether it can be proved, that ever there was any one Infant of true Church-members, that was not rightfully a Church-member himself from the Creation till *Christ's* days? Or from the Creation till this day; except the Anabaptists, who reject the benefit, whose case we will not presume to determine?

#### Baptist.

*Antiqu.* 41. Whether this Query be not the same we had before? and whether what is said to it, may not also suffice to this?

#### Presbyterian.

Query 42. Seeing that Infants have been *de facto* Church-members from the Creation to this day (as far as any Records can lead us) Is it likely, that the Lord, and Head, and all-sufficient Governour of his Church, would have permitted his Church till now, to be actually made up of such subjects, as in regard of Age be dis-

disfallowed, and suffered his Church to be wrong framed till now? Or is it a reasonable, modest and lawful undertaking, to go about now in the end of the World to make God a new framed Church, as to the age of the Subjects? And is it not more modest and safe, to live quietly in a Church of that frame, as all the Saints of Heaven lived in, till the other day, as a few Anabaptists did attempt an Alteration?

### Baptist.

*Antiqu.* 42. Whether it be not utterly untrue, that Infants were Members of the Church *de facto*, i.e. to be brought to partake of Ordinances Practical in the Church, save only from *Abraham* to the end of the Law? And whether all the Pedobaptists in the world have not hitherto been unable to shew any one instance before *Abraham*, or since the Law was abrogated, so much as one Infant admitted to any such Ordinance in the Church of God, according to what the Scriptures afford in this case? And whether it be not as modest in us to labour to restore Baptism to its pure use in the Church, both in respect of the subject and manner of Administration thereof, as it was for the Protestants to do the like in respect of the Lords Supper? Also whether your pretending the Authority of the universal Church, be not the same figment, with which the Papists deceived themselves and others? And how can you pretend the universal Church, when the Primitive Church is on our side?

### Presbyterian.

Query 43. Whether considering Christs own Infant-Membership, and his kind reception of Infants, and his chiding those that would have kept them off, and his offers of taking in all the Jewish Nation, (*Matth.* 23. 37.) and that they were broken off by unbelief, and consequently the Seed of Believers broken off from the Church Universal, and that whole Households are oft said to be baptized, and that Paul pronounceth Believers children holy, and that Christ (*Mat.* 28.) commanded his Ministers, as much as in them lieth, to disciple all Nations baptizing them, &c?

*Baptist.*

*Antiqu. 43. Whether Christs Infants Church-membership did not pertain to the Jewish Church only, Gal. 4. 4. born under the Law only, &c. And whether he was not about 30 years when he entred in our Profession, Heb. 3. 3. The Apostle and High Priest of our Profession Christ Iesus. See Luke 3. And then whether his example be not flat against you?*

Also whether Christs only praying for Infants, and not baptizing them though brought to him, neither ordering any other to do it that we reade of, do not shew us that Infants may be under the blessings of Christ without baptism? And whether you may not tremble to presume to do more then he did, or appointed to be done? Are you wiser then he?

Also whether it lies within the power of any Minister to discipline an Infant; or shew us one Infant with you, or any Pedobaptist ever made a disciple? or be pleased to come and make my Infants disciples if you can, and I promise you I will assist you what I can in the baptizing them? and not only so, but do my best to employ you elsewhere, I speak it seriously. And whether this would not do more to decide the Controversie, then all the Books that are written by any of you? and if you cannot do this, how will *Matth. 28. 19.* warrant you to baptize Infants, sith its plain that discipling goes before baptizing? and how disciples are to be made we think it best to learn of Iesus, *John 4. 3.* How think you? Do you indeed believe, that any person being of the Nation, entitles them to baptism? why then who is not a fit subject, seeing all Infants and men too are of one Nation or another? and if there be other Qualifications necessary, whether to be taught be not one of the chief of them? and why do you say we take Infants away from Christs Church, because we baptize them not; are they in it before baptized? if so, how do we take them away?

*Presbyterian.*

*Query 44. In summe, whether 1. God would not have Parents devote*



devote their children to him, and enter them according to their capacity in his Covenant? 2. Whether also he doth not accept into his Covenant all that are faithfully thus devoted to him, and be not peculiarly their God, that such children are holy? 3. Whether they are not as certainly Members, according to an Infant-capacity, of the visible Church, as they are of all Kingdoms under Heaven? 4. Whether there be not far more hope of their salvation, then of those without? 5. Whether the Covenant doth not make their salvation certain, if they so die? 6. Whether the Investiture and Solemnization of their Covenant with Christ should not be made in Infancy, &c?

### Baptist.

*Antiqu.* 44. In sum, 1. Whether we do not as much to our Infants (in our capacity) as Christ did to the Infants which were brought to him? and will not that satisfy, unless we go from him to follow you? And as to the business of the Covenant, let us hear what Mr. Baxter saith, *More Reas.* p. 86. *All Mankind is brought by Christ under a Covenant of Grace, which is not vain or repealed by God, but as their abuse of the grace of the Covenant may cast them out; for as a Covenant of entire Nature was made with all mankind in innocent Adam; so a Covenant of grace was made with all mankind in lapsed Adam, Gen. 3.15. in the Promised Seed; and renewed again with all mankind in Noah, &c.* And now we ask whether our Infants according to this account of the Covenant of Grace be not in it without baptism, sith they have not abused the grace of the Covenant? and whether baptism be not far more proper, when after they have corrupted themselves by sin, they come to humiliation, and so to enter into this Covenant upon the termes of the Gospel?

Whether your Exposition of the universal Church, upon *Mat. 28.19.* do take in the Practice of the Apostles in pursuance of that Commission to the *Apos.* and the Exposition of the Baptists? and if not, then you either deny us to be of the universal Church, or else you have not the Exposition of the Church universal?

## Presbyterian.

Query 45. *How inconsiderable a Part of the universal Church do the Anabaptists hold Communion with? And do they not unchurch almost all the Churches on Earth? (may we not think, that they rob Christ of more then nine Parts of ten of his Kingdom, or Church universal? V.p. 305.)*

## Baptist.

Antiqu. 45. Whether upon *Luthers* revolt from the Pope, you were not upbraided with holding communion with an inconsiderable part of the universal Church? why do you take up the Papists weapons? Did not that pious man that succoured *Athanasius* in the time of the *Arrian* persecution answer the Objection well, when he said, *The cause of truth is not therefore impaired, because I am alone; --- Glory not therefore in multitudes, for it is not the multitude but the cause that justifieth or condemneth?* Also whether we may not also conclude, that many are of the universal Church, which do not communicate with us or your selves? and yet whether the separation from many Pedobaptists will not justify our separation from you more clearly?

## Presbyterian.

Query 46. *Whether they can possibly hope, that ever the church on Earth will unite upon their terms, of rejecting all their Infants from the visible Church, and renouncing all our Infant-Rights and Benefits conferred by the Baptismal Covenant of Grace?*

## Baptist.

Antiqu. 46. Whether this be in effect to say, What will these feeble Jews do? And why may we not hope that this great mistake of yours may vanish, as well as that great mistake of *Austin*, and the generality of men professing Christianity, who brought Infants also to the Lords Table, and that for many hundreds

dreds of years together, and defended it by as plausible reasons as any you have for baptizing them? Could God reform so great and general an error, forced on by Learning and Authority of eminent men; And shall we think this thing only too hard for God? our small number shall not make us doubt, for we know God doth great things by small means. And what Baptismal grace do we desire you to renounce, when we only desire you to mend an error; Did the twelve disciples, *Acts 19.* renounce any baptismal grace, when (according to the Interpretation of the Ancients) they were baptized again? Surely Reformation is no error.

Presbyterian.

*Query 47. And whether if they continue to the Worlds end to separate from almost all the Churches and unchurch them, their Employment will not be still to serve the great Enemy of Love and Concord, against the Lord of Love and Peace, and against the Prosperity of Faith and Godliness, and against the welfare of the Church and Souls, and to the scandal and hardning of the ungodly?*

Baptist.

*Antiqu. 47. Whether the separation is not justly chargeable upon those which cause divisions and offences, by asserting and maintaining such errors, as being admitted, the way of God must be corrupted, or laid aside? and whether these are not the men, that (at least unawares) serve the design of the great enemy, and whether you are not guilty of the fault wherewith you would charge us?*

Presbyterian.

*48. Whether too many well-meaning, but weak Christians, are not disaffected to lawful and warrantable things in the Worship of God, merely because they see such as are ungodly use and own them? And whether if God should but let us have a King and other Rulers, that were against Infant-Baptism, and singing of Psalms, &c. and*

would make Laws for their own way, and impose it on others, so that the ungodly multitude should fall in with them, it would not presently cure many that are now for such Opinions?

*Baptist.*

*Antiqu.* 48. Whether many, but weak Christians, would hold to the error of Infant-sprinkling, but meerly because J.B. and Mr. Baxter, &c. do so. And whether this be not as much weakness of the one hand, as the case put by you on the other? and whether both ought not to be amended? And whether the latter part of this Query do not shew, that to follow the greatest number is not always the best way? And why then would you discourage us by our *Paucity*? And whether such Considerations might not have discouraged the Apostles, seeing they were to alter the state of Religion in the Jewish Church, yea, throughout the whole world?

*Presbyterian.*

Query 49. Whether Mr. Baxter in the second and third part of that his second defence of our Infants Rights, have not sufficiently detected the great and notorious untruths in Fact and History, wherein with Mr. H.D. Trearise of Baptism, and Reply to Mr. Willes is fully stuffed.

*Baptist.*

*Antiqu.* 49. Whether Mr. D. and Mr. Tombes have not sufficiently detected Mr. Baxters mistakes in many of his Works about Infant-baptism, and particularly in Mr. Tombes his *Felo de se*. Also whether Mr. Willes exceptions against Mr. D. are not well foiled by Mr. D. in his twofold Defence of his Treatise of Baptism; And whether Mr. Baxter did ever yet, or ever will accept of Mr. Tombes his serious Challenge lately made in these words.

I Challenge him to set down distinctly his Theles, concerning the Grace he means, the Covenant of Grace, what and whose it is, how it is baptismal, what are the rights and benefits conferred to Infants

by it, using words in the ir proper sence and gannine notions; and then without Questions, Exclamations, Flirts, Suppositions improved, set down his Scriptures, and form his Arguments substantially---and then I doubt not but learned and accurate Disputants will see his folly, &c. Postscript to Mr. D. second Reply p.267.

### Presbyterian.

Query 50. Whether the Anabaptists schism, or separation from Communion with our Churches be not worse yet then their simple Opinion? And whether it be not desirable, and possible, that some may be found out, and terms laid down, in which good and sober men on both sides would agree and hold Communion?

### Baptist.

Antiqu. 50. Whether the Papists may not on fairer Grounds Query thus with the Protestant, then you can do with us, especially when the Cause you manage against us is so doubtful in the judgement of its best friends. as we shewed in our Preface; and here we shall further add what Mr. T. notes in his first Reply, p.126. Mr. Chillingworth (saith he) in his Answer to Knot's *Charity maintain'd*, part. 1.c.3. §.44. p.152. saith, The doctrine of Infant-baptism is of that sort, of which the Scripture is silent. And the Oxford-Divines, in their Reasons of the present Judgement of the University, &c. June 1. 1674. Do. lect. 4. p.9. say, That without the Consent, Judgment and Practice of the universal Church, (which they distinguish from the Scriptures) they should be at a loss when they are called upon for proof of the baptizing Infants. Now this considered with what Dr. Taylor saith, *Dissuasive from Popery*, p.118. That it is certain, there is no universal or prime Tradition for baptizing infants, then whether you may not more securely forbear baptizing your Infants, till endow'd with knowledge and faith, then to do it without. And in the mean time retain your opinion about their being in the Covenant of Grace, and let Christs Ministers or your selves pray for them after the example of Christ. And whether this might not be a more likely

way for a lasting Peace between the Baptists and the Pedobaptists, and more consonant to the Scriptures than the way propounded by you?

And seeing it shall come into your hearts to make some Overtures for peace, we desire you would prosecute that needful Work. And whether it may not better be done by personal Conference in a friendly and Christian manner, than by writing Books one to another. And whether the Baptists have not offered this, and bin rejected by you in such their tenders of friendship?

May these *Queries* and *Antiqueries* have an effectual tendency to the increase of Love and Christian Friendship, and if not, whether it had not been better they had been unwritten?

---

F I N I S.

1666

---



## The Postscript.

*Shewing that Infant-baptism is contrary to the Command of Christ.*

**R**ecieving lately in Writing a Proposition from a Minister of the Church of England, to which I sent him certain Arguments, to prove what is denied in the said Proposition; I shall here offer the same to Consideration. The Proposition is this,

*Prop.*  
Infant-baptism is not contrary to the Command of Christ.

*Contra.*  
Infant-baptism is contrary to the Command of Christ.

### Arg. 1.

If Infant-baptism be not contrary to the Command of Christ, then it is of divine Institution,

*From the institution of baptism.*

But Infant-baptism is not of divine Institution,

*Ergo*, Infant-baptism is contrary to the Command of Christ.

*The Major is true, because there is only one Baptism instituted by Christ. The Minor is true, because no man can shew any divine Institution of Infant-baptism.*

### Arg. 2.

If infant-baptism be not contrary to the Command of Christ, then it agrees with Christs Commission for the perpetuity of Baptism, *Mat. 28. 19.*

*From the institution of Baptism.*

But Infant-baptism is not agreeable to the Commission ~~from~~ for the perpetuity of Baptism, *Mat. 28. 19.*

*Ergo*, Infant-baptism is contrary to the Command of Christ.

*The Major is true, because Christ commanded nothing contrary to his own Commission. The Minor is true, sith no man can shew any Agreement between the Commission and Infant-baptism.*

### Arg. 3.

If infant-baptism be not contrary to the Command of Christ, then it is agreeable to the practice of the Apostolical Churches,

*From the practice of the first Church.*

But infant-baptism is not agreeable to the practice of the Apostolical Churches,

*Ergo*, Infant-baptism is contrary to the Command of Christ.

*The Major is true, because the Apostolical Church did observe all that*

that Christ commanded in the case of baptism. The Minor is true, because no man can shew, the Apostolical Churches did baptize so much as one Infant.

## Arg. 4.

From the necessity of Repentance, where sin is washed away baptismally.

If infant-baptism be not contrary to the Command of Christ, then it is the baptism of Repentance for Remission of sin.

But infant-baptism is not the baptism of repentance for remission of sin;

Ergo, Infant-baptism is contrary to the Command of Christ.

The Major is true, because Christ commanded no baptism, but the baptism of repentance for Remission of sin; Acts 2. 38. and Eph. 4. 5. The Minor is true, because Infants have all the Remission needful in Infancy, without repentance, else they can have no Remission.

## Arg. 5.

From the ill consequence of Infant-baptism.

That which hath in a great measure, and naturally tends wholly to make void the baptism commanded by Christ, is contrary to the Command of Christ.

But infant-baptism hath in a great measure, and naturally tends wholly to make void the baptism commanded by Christ.

Ergo, infant-baptism is contrary to the Command of Christ.

The Major is true, because Christ commands nothing to make void his own command. The Minor is true, for where Infant-baptism is generally received, there believers baptism ceaseth.

## Arg. 6.

For the unreasonableness thereof.

If infant-baptism be as unreasonable, as to baptise persons when they are asleep or dead, then it is contrary to the Command of Christ.

But infant-baptism is as unreasonable, as to baptise persons when they are asleep or dead.

Ergo, Infant-baptism is contrary to the command of Christ.

The Major is true, because Christ commanded nothing that is unreasonable, I mean, that which is really so according to truth, and not in mans judgement only. The Minor is true, first because those who baptize Infants do usually do it when they are asleep;

Secondly,

Secondly, because the Grounds usually insisted on for infant-baptism, will as well justify the baptizing Persons asleep or dead; I mean, such only as have known and believed in the Lord Jesus; yea, the Scripture may seem (according to Interpreters, to hint some such thing to have been done in the Christian Church, and he not approve it) but no such intimation touching any Infant.

*Arg. 7.*

That practice which renders the practice of Christ and his true followers, (who were baptized in Rivers, or much water) superfluous or ridiculous, and which agreeth not with the word *baptize*, when used in the New Testament to express the Act done in that Ordinance, is contrary to the Command of Christ.

From the dishonour it offereth to Christ's practice.

But the sprinkling of Infants now used by the *Presbyterians*, renders the practice of Christ and his true followers, (who were baptized in Rivers or much water) superfluous or ridiculous, and agreeth not with the signification of the word *Baptize*, when used to express, (according to the New Testament) the Act done in that Ordinance.

*Ergo*, Infant-baptism is contrary to the command of Christ.

*The Major is evident, because Christ would command nothing to reflect dishonour upon his own practice.*

*The Minor is true, because if sprinkling a little water on the face only be sufficient, then immersion or dipping in the River must needs be superfluous, &c. neither can the word Baptize and Rantize, with any equity of speech or good sense, be used to express the same action.*

Thus, though we justly refuse infant-baptism, because no man can prove it commanded by Christ, yet that we may more effectually perswade our Countreymen, to admit of the restoration of this Ordinance to pristine integrity, we have offered these Arguments to shew how contrary to Christ's Command is that darling Tradition of Pedobaptism.

**F I N I S.**

1. The first of these is the fact that the original law as it was passed in 1906 was not intended to be a permanent law. It was intended to be a temporary law, to be in force for a limited period of time, and to be subject to amendment or repeal at any time.

Benjamin Grantham  
his book  
1684

16 JU 66

John G. P. [illegible]

699